“The Thin End of the Wedge—are past draconian adoptive practices re-emerging in the 21st Century?”

International and domestic law was implemented to protect the civil and human rights of minority and/or disadvantaged groups. But according to welfare workers both here and in the United States substance abusing parents is an at risk group suffering mental health problems and poverty whose rights are being violated by the removal of their children. They state this is a punitive measure that creates more problems than it solves. The Australian government is failing in its duty of care to protect this vulnerable group.

“Drug dependency is a chronic relapsing mental health condition recognised as such by the International Classification of diseases (ICD-10 of the World Health Organisation and the Diagnostic and Statistic Manual (DSM-IV) of Metal Disorders of the American Psychiatric association.

Often substance abusing parents were themselves abused as children, many being victims of past poor welfare practices. Rather than being discriminated against by having their children removed families or mothers in crisis should be given the same support and access to care as would be made available to any other person suffering a disability. To put this into context a depressed mother can cause more damage to her baby than one who is drug addicted, but not suffering depression. Yet we do not routinely remove the children of depressed or anxious mothers. It is therefore more about punishment of the parent than supporting the child. Being depressed is considered something we have no control over whereas the general consensus is a drug addict chooses that lifestyle. Simplistic reasoning that is just not true.

Rehabilitation for drug addicted mothers has proven successful both here and the US and safer for the child than being placed with strangers in the foster care system. Research also indicates that chances of successful treatment increase dramatically when parents are allowed to keep their young children with them. Research also provided evidence that the infants of drug addicted mothers being given supportive treatment did better than babies taken and fostered. Leaving researchers with the opinion that separation from their mothers was more toxic than cocaine. Keeping children with parents, whilst offering supportive preservation services and drug treatment is safer, more stable and less traumatic for children than being in the care of strangers in the foster care system. For instance large proportions of homeless adults grew up in foster care.

The net that catches those the State deem unfit is cast very wide indeed. The homeless, women who consume too much alcohol or smoke heavily, survivors of domestic violence are all at risk of being reported to DOCs and having their child/ren removed.

The focus on removing children from substance abusing parents is directly connected to Bronwyn Bishop’s chairing of two inquiries. Bishop’s support for and promotion of adoption coinciding with her zero tolerance of drug abuse has resulted in her calling for all children under five to be immediately removed from their parents and placed out for adoption, irrespective of whether they are still using drugs or actually causing them any harm. It also coincides with the fact there are fewer infants
available for adoption. The fear that many survivors of the white stolen generation have is that children once again will lose all contact with parents and extended family. Further the child will receive a new birth certificate effectively obliterating the child’s former identity. This could very easily end up being another dark chapter of Australian history with yet another stolen generation.

In the substance abuse Inquiry persons who disagreed with Bishop’s perspective were openly attacked, ridiculed and the final Report did not reflect the evidence of the attending experts or what those working on the ground found to be best practice. Similar objections were made about her attitude in the Inquiry into intercountry adoptions. Experts in child care were outraged by her recommendations, as were family members of substance abusers.

Bishop has been openly supportive of adoptive parent groups and supports the Deborra-lee Furness campaign to overhaul adoption laws in Australia. Bishop’s response to adoptive parents’ claim at the Inquiry of being discriminated against because of the so-called ‘anti-adoption’ culture causing them lengthy delays in adopting was: “Shocking.” The ‘anti-adoption’ slogan was used extensively by Bishop and pro-adoption forces in their campaign to advance their agenda of expanding the overseas adoption program. Bishop seems to have forgotten that the fundamental principle in intercountry adoption is that Adoption is a service for children not for adults wishing to acquire a child. Bishop’s recommendations and the fact the government never corrected the lie repeated throughout the media that there are millions of orphans needing adoption is another worrying sign that there is indeed a push back towards adoption. The government is very well aware that there are not enough orphans to meet the needs of western adopters and demanding them only creates black markets and child trafficking.30

Originally it was felt with a change of government Bishop’s cruel and backward looking recommendations would be relegated to the historical dust heap, but unfortunately her anti-family pro-adoption stance has hit a chord. It resonates with an underlying ideology in areas of child welfare that believe if parents are unfit rather than be supported they should be punished by having their child/ren removed. It resonates with infertile couples who want to adopt as literally the supply of infants for adoption has all but dried up. It resonates with Government because in the short term it is the cheapest option.

In December 2008, parents described as “recreational cannabis users” had their two children removed: a 15 month-old girl and a month-old boy. They fought all the way to the Supreme Court to get their babies back. There was no evidence of child abuse and the judge “slammed DOCS staff who forcibly removed two babies … [as] gross abuse of power”. Nearly 200 babies were taken into care in Victoria last year alone. Once taken, it is very hard, particularly for poor mothers, with mental health problems, to regain their children. Asked if parents could reclaim their children Bishop stated: “No, not after adoption.”

In February this year a Report was released that seems to add weight to the assumption that Bishop’s recommendations are being taken seriously. The Report
states that 14% of Victorian children being placed in care are under 12 months old and are generally removed because their parents are substance abusers or the mother has been exposed to domestic violence. The Report focuses on issues around parental visitation – time and frequency. The Report is worrying for a number of reasons. It seems to be moving towards formalising the removal of infants by:

1. Promoting foster care of babies
2. Advocating support for foster carers rather than support for families in crisis
3. Advocating to limit access to infants by family members
4. Failing to acknowledge bonding in-utero
5. Failing to adequately acknowledge the trauma of separation for infants—especially babies under 3 months
6. Does not highlight any of the problems inherent in the foster care system or high levels of psychological damage amongst fostered and adopted children
7. Promotes kinship care for Indigenous, but not non-Indigenous
8. Ignores research that underscores the necessity for contact with family

In failing to acknowledge that an infant bonds in-utero and to assume that bonding is the product of parenting by a primary care-taker repeats the mistakes of past removal policies. The relationship between mother and child is diminished and support for the mother is given less relevance. Why support the mother if any other carer will do? This was the assumption on which the practice of removing thousands of infants at birth from their unwed mothers was based. It was assumed that the infant would automatically bond to who ever fed and nurtured it, therefore any contact with its biological family was deemed unnecessary. The adoption industry, which was based on the demand for adoptable white infants, ignored all other research or anecdotal evidence that did not support that contention. There is now a huge body of research that indicates that the infant and mother are a dyad, and separating them causes major psychological damage to both. Further that separating a child from its family and knowledge of ancestry increases the risk of suicide threefold and pre-disposes the individual to life long mental health problems. The Report states that a flaw in its methodology was the researchers were not able to gauge the infant’s perspective. Researchers working in other areas have documented in detail the neurological and developmental damage sustained by an infant removed from its mother. The Report focused on research from the 1960s to support its position for placing children in foster care and gave great weight to a study done by Quinton, Rushton, Dance & Mayes in 1997 that was strongly criticised by another researcher for being methodologically flawed and failing to include extensive research on the importance of maintaining links for children with their families. When parents divorce it is considered important for the psychological health of the child to maintain links with the non-custodial parent and extended family – why is there such a push to limit contact in foster care and to move towards permanent extinguishment of all parental contact by the use of adoption? Knowing the cost to both infant and mother by separating them is like continuing to promote tobacco when you know it causes cancer.

Robin Turner who recently contacted you, and for whom I have prepared this overview was one such mother. Robin’s son Phillip was born with a medical condition. She was told that if she did not sign adoption papers her son would not receive necessary medical attention unless she came up with thousands of dollars to pay for his operation. Robin did not believe the social worker and refused to sign, when she continued to refuse she was told her son had died and she had “killed him”.
Robin blamed herself and never went on to have further children. Her son languished in an institution for nearly 12 months because no-one wanted to adopt a child that was not perfect. Phillip finally tracked down Robin in 2008. This story is not from the past this is a drama that is unfolding now. The person who forged Robin’s signature on the adoption papers misspelt both her Christian names hence it took years for Phillip to find Robin. The social worker that dealt with Robin at the time is still alive and holds a senior position in a large hospital. I have prepared a Brief for a human rights lawyer who is looking at the case. Robin and Phillip’s case is evidenced in their medical and social work files.

What happened to Robin is not unique. An Inquiry into past adoption practices held between 1998-2000 heard more than 300 stories from women who similarly stated they had their children stolen. These findings were further supported by an inquiry conducted by the Tasmanian government.

Indigenous representatives from the group Link-Up gave evidence at the NSW Inquiry stating that Aboriginal mothers similarly had their children stolen by the same social workers, doctors and nurses using the same brutal methods in the same hospitals as white mothers. Pillows and sheets were used to prevent mothers from seeing their infants at the birth to stop the bonding process. Mothers were drugged and forcibly restrained and, if they persisted to refuse to sign papers, they were threatened with being reported as unfit mothers and having their consents dispensed with anyway or as in Robin’s case told their baby had died. It is not surprising then that in 1972 nearly 10,000 newborn babies were permanently separated from their mothers and made available for adoption. When these practices were curtailed adoptions dropped and have continued to drop so by 2007 there were only 59 adoptions and most were special needs not newborns.

Australia has a shameful history of child removal practices, not only of Indigenous but of non-Indigenous babies and children. The government has acknowledged there is a white stolen generation. Yet we were not included in the 2008 apology. If a white mother’s partner was Indigenous then he and their children have been apologized too, but the white mother has not. The Rudd apology included Indigenous mothers who were subject to the same laws as their non-Indigenous sisters. After 1969 the NSW Protection Board Act was abolished therefore all mothers who had their babies forcibly taken in hospitals were subject to the same laws. It must also be noted that the Federal apology was based on the premise that Protection Board Acts empowered local authorities to remove Indigenous children. In a recent legal case it was stated that the opinion of the Solicitor General to the Government in 1949 and 1954 was that the Aboriginal Protection Board “did not have the power to remove neglected Aboriginal children from their families.” The Australian Government promoted adoption of white babies and had a policy of not allowing mothers who were unsupported to see their child at the birth, have access whilst confined or the opportunity to feed their infant. The Adoption Acts rather than protect mothers’ rights were instrumentally used to legitimise their newborn’s removal. History unacknowledged is history repeated and we fear Bronwyn’s agenda is just that.

---
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